

1 INTRODUCTION

The US Forest Service (USFS), Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) and Tahoe National Forest; the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA); and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) are preparing a joint environmental document for the California Pacific Electric Company (CalPeco) 625 and 650 Electrical Line Upgrade Project. The document is an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the LTBMU and Tahoe National Forest prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S. Code 4321-4347), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulation [CFR] 1500-1508), Forest Service Manual 1950, and Forest Service Handbook 1909.15; an EIS for TRPA pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Public Law 96-551), Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure; and an environmental impact report (EIR) for CPUC pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). All three agencies have determined that an EIS/EIS/EIR is needed to effectively analyze the proposal and evaluate impacts. In addition, the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), as a federal cooperating agency, will be responsible for the scope and content of the NEPA portion of the environmental document as it pertains to lands within its jurisdictional boundaries in Martis Valley. CalPeco is the project applicant.

1.1 PROJECT REQUIRING ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The proposed 625 and 650 Electrical Line Upgrade Project would consist primarily of an upgrade of CalPeco's existing 625 and 650 electrical power lines and associated substations from 60 kilovolt (kV) to 120 kV to allow the entire North Lake Tahoe Transmission System to operate at 120 kV. The project would consist of six primary components: 1) removal of the existing 625 Line and construction of a new, rerouted 625 Line; 2) rebuild of the existing 650 Line with potential for realignments based on the action alternatives considered; 3) realignment of two short segments of the 650 Line and removal of the replaced segments; 4) rebuild of the Northstar Tap into a fold (a "fold" allows for service to be maintained at a substation in the event of an interruption in service on either side of the power line feeding it); 5) rebuild of a 1.6-mile long section of the existing 132 Line in the Town of Truckee; and 6) upgrade, modification, and/or decommissioning of six substations. These improvements would increase the ability to maintain the current maximum system loads during an outage on any one of the four sections of the system (described in detail in Chapter 3), and decrease reliance on the Kings Beach Diesel Generation Station. In addition, rebuilding and realigning the power lines would reduce the likelihood of outages associated with high winds, downed trees, snow loading, and forest fires, and would improve access to the lines for maintenance, emergency outage response, and repair activities.

The project features and proposed activities are predominantly located on lands managed by the USFS; these lands are located in the LTBMU and Tahoe National Forest. Portions of the project are also located in the Town of Truckee and the unincorporated Placer County communities of Kings Beach and Tahoe City, on lands within the Martis Creek Lake Recreation Area, managed by the USACE, and on private lands.

Through public scoping and agency coordination, four action alternatives were identified for detailed analysis in the EIS/EIS/EIR. Several additional alternatives were considered but determined to be infeasible and rejected from detailed consideration. The four action alternatives define different approaches to implementing the project in various segments along the 625 Line and 650 Line alignments. The analysis included in this EIS/EIS/EIR will be used by the USFS, TRPA, and CPUC to render a decision and select an alternative.

1.2 INTENDED USES OF THE EIS/EIS/EIR AND REGULATORY DECISION FRAMEWORK

On May 18, 2011, the USFS LTBMU and Tahoe National Forest, TRPA, CPUC, and the USACE entered into a memorandum of understanding for the preparation of this EIS/EIS/EIR. TRPA, USFS, and CPUC will use the EIS/EIS/EIR to consider the environmental effects, mitigation measures, and action alternatives, when reviewing the project for approval. The EIS/EIS/EIR will serve as the USFS's NEPA compliance document; TRPA's compliance document with respect to its Compact, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure; and as CPUC's CEQA compliance document. Federal cooperating agencies, including the USACE, and state responsible and trustee agencies (discussed below) may also use this EIS/EIS/EIR for subsequent discretionary actions.

1.2.1 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

NEPA provides an interdisciplinary framework for federal agencies to develop information that will help them to take environmental factors into account in their decision-making (42 USC 4321, 40 CFR 1500.1). NEPA requires preparation of an EIS whenever a proposed major federal action (e.g., a proposal for legislation or an activity financed, assisted, conducted, or approved by a federal agency) would significantly affect the human environment. The principle objectives of NEPA and the CEQ regulations is for the federal government, and those regulated by federal agencies, to design, locate, and operate projects in ways that reduce adverse environmental impacts for existing and succeeding generations.

NEPA requires that a lead agency "include (in an EIS) appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives (40 CFR 1502.14[f])." An EIS shall also include discussions of "means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts (if not fully covered under Section 1502.14[f])." In preparing a record of decision under 40 CFR 1505.2, a lead agency is required to, "[s]tate whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted and summarized where applicable for any mitigation."

CalPeco is seeking to obtain a Special Use Authorization from the USFS for construction of the project on National Forest System land. The USFS is also the lead federal agency for compliance with NEPA and will be responsible for compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

1.2.2 TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING COMPACT, REGIONAL PLAN, AND CODE OF ORDINANCES

TRPA is a bi-state regional planning agency created in 1969 by federal law, the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, to oversee development on both the California and Nevada sides of Lake Tahoe. Under the Compact, an EIS is an informational document used in the planning and decision-making process for a proposed project. The purpose of an EIS is not to recommend either approval or denial of the project, but to disclose objective information that can be used in rendering an informed decision.

Article VII of the Compact presents important TRPA policies relevant to the preparation and use of an EIS. Key provisions of the article are presented below:

- ▲ Article VII (a) (2) states that when acting upon matters that have a significant effect on the environment, TRPA shall "prepare and consider a detailed environmental impact statement before deciding to approve or carry out any project."

- ▲ Article VII (a) (3) states that the EIS shall “study, develop and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action for any project which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.”
- ▲ Article VII (a) (5) requires TRPA to “initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects.”

TRPA is the lead agency under TRPA laws and regulations. Section 6.16 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure require that an EIS is certified to be in compliance, procedurally and substantively, with Article VII of the Compact, Chapter 3 of the Code, and the Rules of Procedure before a project may be approved.

1.2.3 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Section 15064[f][1]), preparation of an EIR is required whenever a project may result in a potentially significant environmental impact. An EIR is an informational document used to inform public agency decision-makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while substantially lessening or avoiding any of the significant environmental impacts.

CEQA requires that state and local government agencies consider the environmental effects of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects (PRC Section 21000 et seq.). CEQA also requires that each public agency avoid or mitigate to less-than-significant levels, wherever feasible, the significant environmental effects of a project. If a project would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated to less-than-significant levels, the project can still be approved, but the lead agency decision-makers must issue a “statement of overriding considerations” explaining in writing the specific economic, social, or other considerations that they believe make those significant effects acceptable.

The CPUC is the lead agency for compliance with CEQA for this project. CalPeco must comply with CPUC General Order 131-D, which contains the permitting requirements for the construction, replacement, and maintenance of facilities for the generation of electricity; transmission, power, and distribution line facilities; and substations. CalPeco is seeking to obtain a Permit to Construct (PTC) from the CPUC for this project.

1.3 SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE EIS/EIS/EIR

Pursuant to NEPA, TRPA regulations, and CEQA, the discussion of potential effects on the environment is focused on those impacts that are potentially significant. The LTBMU Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines, TRPA’s Initial Environmental Checklist, and the State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Initial Study Checklist were used, in part, to determine the scope and focus of this EIS/EIS/EIR.

On March 26, 2012, the USFS, TRPA, and CPUC issued a Notice of Intent (NOI)/Notice of Preparation (NOP). The NOI was published in the Federal Register Volume 77 Issue 69, on April 10, 2012. The NOI/NOP was also sent to the California State Clearinghouse, Nevada State Clearinghouse, cooperating agencies, California responsible and trustee agencies, other interested public agencies, interested parties and organizations and affected property owners (within 300 feet of the project boundaries). The NOI/NOP was used to solicit views of interested persons, organizations, and agencies as they relate to the scope and content of the information to be included and analyzed in the EIS/EIS/EIR, and provide information on the dates and times of public scoping meeting. There is no defined circulation period under NEPA or TRPA regulations; however, CEQA requires a minimum scoping period of 30 days. Accordingly, a public scoping period was set for a 30-day period, between

March 26, 2012 and April 25, 2012. Because the NOI was published in the Federal Register after release of the NOP/NOI, the comment period was extended to May 10, 2012.

Two public scoping meetings were conducted to provide interested parties with the opportunity to learn more about the project and to express their views on the content of the EIS/EIS/EIR. The scoping meetings were held on April 17, 2012 at the North Tahoe Event Center, 8313 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California; and, on April 19, 2012 at the Truckee Ranger District, 10811 Stockrest Springs Road, Truckee, California. The April 17, 2012 meeting was held before the TRPA Hearings Officer. Appendix A, Notice of Preparation and Scoping Summary Report, of this draft EIS/EIS/EIR contains the Scoping Summary Report with a table listing the substantive comments on the NOI/NOP as well as copies of the comment letters.

Based on a review of the project and the input received during the scoping process, this draft EIS/EIS/EIR includes an evaluation of the following environmental issue areas:

- | | |
|--|---|
| ▲ Land Use | ▲ Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| ▲ Forestry Resources | ▲ Public Services and Utilities |
| ▲ Scenic Resources | ▲ Traffic and Transportation |
| ▲ Geology, Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage | ▲ Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Climate Change |
| ▲ Hydrology and Water Quality | ▲ Noise |
| ▲ Biological Resources | ▲ Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice |
| ▲ Recreation | ▲ Growth Inducing Impacts |
| ▲ Heritage and Cultural Resources | |

In addition, in accordance with the Compact, TRPA has adopted environmental quality standards, or “environmental threshold carrying capacities,” which were initially adopted by the TRPA Governing Board in 1982 (TRPA Resolution 82-11). This draft EIS/EIS/EIR provides an evaluation of the project alternatives in the context of TRPA’s environmental threshold standards and the ability to achieve and maintain such standards to protect the unique values of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The nine resource areas for which threshold standards were adopted by TRPA are:

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| ▲ Water Quality | ▲ Vegetation |
| ▲ Air Quality | ▲ Wildlife Habitat |
| ▲ Scenic Resources | ▲ Noise |
| ▲ Soil Conservation | ▲ Recreation |
| ▲ Fish Habitat | |

Because the action alternatives would not affect any lands used for agricultural production, zoned for agriculture, or considered important farmland, this issue is not discussed in detail in the EIS/EIS/EIR. Housing is not discussed in detail in this EIS/EIS/EIR as the proposed project does not include construction of housing as part of the project, would not displace existing housing, and would not generate demand for new housing (i.e., no increase in year-round employees that seek housing). Potential project effects on population and employment are addressed in Section 5.5, Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project, and Section 5.6, Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice.

1.4 USE OF THIS DOCUMENT BY OTHER AGENCIES

Other federal, state, regional, and local agencies are involved in the review and approval of the project, including cooperating federal agencies under NEPA and trustee and responsible agencies under CEQA. Under

NEPA, a cooperating agency can be any other federal agency that has jurisdiction by law, or other federal agency that has special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in an action (CFR Section 1501.6). Cooperating agencies are designated by agreement between the NEPA lead agency and the cooperating agency, and are encouraged to actively participate in the NEPA process of the lead agency, review and comment on the NEPA document, and use the document in project decision-making. The USACE will be a cooperating agency responsible for ensuring compliance with the scope and content of the NEPA portion of this joint EIS/EIS/EIR as it pertains to lands within the jurisdictional boundaries of the agency, specifically in Martis Valley.

Under CEQA, a responsible agency is an agency other than the lead agency that has legal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project or elements of a project (PRC Section 21069). A trustee agency is a state agency that has jurisdiction by law over natural resources that are held in trust for the people of the State of California (PRC Section 21070). Responsible and trustee agencies are consulted by the CEQA lead agency to ensure the opportunity for input and also review and comment on the draft document. Responsible agencies also use the CEQA document in their decision-making. For the purposes of this EIS/EIS/EIR document, responsible agencies include the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, California Department of Transportation, California Department of State Parks, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District, Placer County, and the Town of Truckee. CDFW would also be a trustee agency for the review of this document.

1.5 ORGANIZATION OF THIS EIS/EIS/EIR

This draft EIS/EIS/EIR is organized into the following chapters so that readers can easily obtain information about the project and its specific environmental issues.

The cover sheet identifies the lead agencies, contact information, contact persons, the title of the project and its location, a brief description of the project, a brief abstract, and comment submission information.

The **Executive Summary** presents an overview of the project alternatives, a listing of significant environmental impacts, and a description of areas of controversy and issues to be resolved.

Chapter 1, Introduction provides a brief project summary; describes the intended uses of the EIS/EIS/EIR and the regulatory framework; describes the focus and scope of the EIS/EIS/EIR; identifies lead, cooperating, responsible, and trustee agencies that may have discretionary authority or other jurisdiction related to the project; outlines the organization of the document; and provides information on public participation and terminology used in the EIS/EIS/EIR.

Chapter 2, Purpose and Need describes the need for the project, project objectives and purpose, and background information relative to the purpose and need.

Chapter 3, Project Alternatives provides a description of the existing North Lake Tahoe Transmission System and information on the need for improvement, describes the action alternatives and elements that are consistent across all action alternatives, and provides details for each action alternative. The No Action/No Project Alternative is then described as well as alternatives that were considered during development of the EIS/EIS/EIR but not evaluated further, and the rationale for their dismissal. Required permits and approvals needed for project implementation are listed, as well as measures proposed by the project applicant as part of the project (i.e., Applicant Proposed Measures or APMs) to address or manage potential environmental impacts.

Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures provides an introductory section and 14 impact analysis sections divided by resource topic area. The introductory section includes a description of the methodology used and projects considered for the cumulative impact analysis. Each

of the 14 impact analysis sections describes the affected environment (i.e., regulatory setting and environmental setting), presents the assumptions used in the environmental analysis and defines the types of environmental effects, then provides an analysis of impacts at an equal level of detail for all alternatives, including the No Action/No Project Alternative and mitigation measures that would avoid or eliminate significant adverse impacts or reduce them to less-than-significant levels, where feasible. Each impact analysis section also provides a discussion of the existing cumulative conditions and the effect that action alternatives would have on the cumulative condition.

Chapter 5, Other NEPA, TRPA, and CEQA Mandated Sections is divided into nine sections that address: 1) environmental effects found not to be significant; 2) significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided; 3) irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources and significant irreversible environmental changes; 4) the relationship between short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; 5) growth-inducing impacts; 6) socioeconomics and environmental justice; 7) environmentally superior/environmentally preferred project alternative; 8) consequences for TRPA environmental threshold carrying capacities; and 9) compliance with applicable federal laws, Executive Orders, and state laws and regulations.

Chapter 6, Consultation and Coordination identifies agencies and individuals that were contacted and coordinated with during preparation of the draft EIS/EIS/EIR.

Chapter 7, References Cited provides a bibliography of sources cited in the draft EIS/EIS/EIR.

Chapter 8, Report Preparers identifies individuals involved in preparing this draft EIS/EIS/EIR.

Chapter 9, Acronyms and Glossary provides a list of acronyms used in the document and a glossary defining key terms not typically found in common usage.

Chapter 10, Index is provided as required by NEPA for easier reference of topics and issues.

1.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND ADDITIONAL STEPS IN THE NEPA/TRPA/CEQA REVIEW PROCESS

This draft EIS/EIS/EIR is being distributed to interested agencies, stakeholder organizations, and individuals. This distribution ensures that interested parties have an opportunity to express their views regarding the environmental effects of the project and to ensure that information pertinent to permits and approvals is provided to decision makers. This document is available for review by the public during normal business hours at the following locations:

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada 89449

US Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
35 College Drive
South Lake Tahoe, California 96150

California Public Utilities
Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

The document is available online at:

<http://www.trpa.org/get-involved/major-projects/>

www.fs.fed.us/r5/lbmu

www.cpuc.ca.gov

It is only necessary to send comments to one agency. Written comments can be sent to the following address:

CalPeco 625 and 650 Electrical Line Upgrade Project
TRPA
Attention: Wendy Jepson
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

For those providing comments via email, please utilize the following format:

Email to: wjepson@trpa.org
Subject Line: CalPeco 625 and 650 Electrical Line Upgrade Project

Comments may be provided in a Microsoft Word Document or PDF format. Please include the commenter's name, agency or organization, and US Postal Service mailing address.

Public meetings on the draft EIS/EIS/EIR will be conducted at the TRPA offices (128 Market Street, Stateline, NV) on November 20 and December 4, 2013. Comments on the draft EIS/EIS/EIR will be accepted at the meetings.

Following the close of the public comment period, a final EIS/EIS/EIR will be prepared and circulated in accordance with NEPA, TRPA, and CEQA requirements that will include responses to all comments and selection of a preferred alternative. Following a 60-day circulation period and lead agency consideration of all comments received during public review of the draft EIS/EIS/EIR and circulation of the final EIS/EIS/EIR, each of the lead agencies (USFS, TRPA, and CPUC) would follow their respective agency processes:

The Forest Service will follow the Project-Level Predecisional Review Process (Objection Process) (36 CFR 218 Subparts A & B). The Forest Supervisor for the LTBMU and the Forest Supervisor for the Tahoe National Forest are the Responsible Officials for the portions of the project on the respective National Forest System lands. Concurrent with the release of the final EIS/EIS/EIR, the Forest Supervisors will include a draft, unsigned Record of Decision. Individuals or entities who have submitted timely, specific written comments regarding this project will have 45 days to file an objection. The Pacific Southwest Region, Regional Forester is the Reviewing Officer and will follow the procedures outlined in 36 CFR 218 to consider objections. The decision of the Responsible Officials will be presented in the final Record of Decision.

The District Engineer for USACE, Sacramento District, or a designated representative, is the Responsible Official for the portions of the project on lands managed by the USACE or for any proposed activities that involve the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States regulated under the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251, et seq.). USACE will follow the procedures outlined in 33 CFR Parts 320 - 332 when reviewing any permit application submitted under the Clean Water Act.

The TRPA Governing Board will use the final EIS/EIS/EIR when considering approval of the project or an alternative to the project. Before consideration of the final EIS/EIS/EIR by the TRPA Governing Board, the Advisory Planning Commission will review and make a recommendation to the Board regarding certification. The TRPA Governing Board will hold a public hearing to consider certification of the final EIS/EIS/EIR and to decide whether or not to approve the project.

The CPUC will use the final EIS/EIS/EIR in conjunction with other information developed in the CPUC's formal record, to act on the CalPeco application for a PTC the project. The CPUC will determine the adequacy of the final EIS/EIS/EIR and issue a proposed decision that would certify the adequacy of the document and recommend approving or denying the PTC. This proposed decision would be circulated to the Commission where an alternative decision could be drafted. The Commission would vote on which decision to approve. If the

CPUC were to approve a project with significant unavoidable environmental impacts, it must state why in a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which would be included in the CPUC's decision on the application.

1.7 Terminology Used in the EIS/EIS/EIR

The EIS/EIS/EIR uses the following terminology to denote the significance of potential environmental impacts of the project:

No Impact: Actions that result in no changes to the physical or human environment. This impact level does not require mitigation.

Direct and Indirect Effects: In accordance with NEPA, direct effects are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place, and indirect effects are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but still reasonably foreseeable.

Beneficial Effect: An effect that would result in an improvement or favorable change in the physical or human environment. This impact level does not require mitigation.

Less-than-Significant Impact: An impact that would not result in a substantial adverse change in the physical or human environment. This impact level does not require mitigation.

Significant Impact: A substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. Feasible mitigation measures or alternatives must be considered in an attempt to reduce significant impacts.

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that would be considered a significant impact as described above if it were to occur; however, the certainty of the impact cannot be immediately determined. For example, although the EIS/EIS/EIR may identify that buried archaeological resources could be found in a particular location, the actual discovery cannot be determined until the time of project construction. For purposes of this EIS/EIS/EIR, a potentially significant impact is treated the same as a significant impact (i.e., it requires consideration of feasible mitigation measures and alternatives).

Cumulative Impact: An impact on the environment that results from the incremental effect of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

Significance Criteria: A criterion established to define at what level an impact would be considered significant (i.e., if an impact exceeds a standard of significance, it would be considered significant). Significance criteria may consider scientific and factual data relative to the lead agency, expert opinion based on facts, and other factors.

Applicant Proposed Measure: An element incorporated into a project by the applicant for the purpose of lessening or avoiding a potential environmental impact.

Mitigation Measure: An action that could feasibly reduce a significant environmental effect. Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments.

In addition, because this environmental document serves three lead agencies, it is useful to identify other terms used herein that are defined by different agencies, and to clarify their meaning in the context of this EIS/EIS/EIR.

Transmission Line: CPUC defines "transmission line" as an electrical line that transmits electricity at high voltages, 200 kV or greater. While TRPA regulations do not include a specific definition for transmission lines, its

planning documents use the term “transmission facilities” “power transmission” to mean electrical conveyance at any voltage. For purposes of this document, the term “transmission line” is used in accordance with the CPUC definition.

Power Line: CPUC defines “power line” as an electrical line that transmits electricity at lower voltages, between 50 kV and 200 kV. TRPA regulations and planning documents include no reference to “power lines.” For purposes of this document, the term “power line” is used to describe the existing and proposed upgraded lines.

Road: The criterion for defining a road varies by the agency with jurisdiction. Each land manager or owner may have different requirements for design, construction, maintenance, and use. For the purposes of this document, the term “road”, “roadway” or “accessway” are used in a general context to identify the route within the project area that is required for construction and/or operation of the project.

TRPA Road Definition: TRPA Code defines “road” as a smooth or paved surface designed for travel by motor vehicles. In general, the impacts are assessed based on the coverage of the road surface.

National Forest System Road: Roads on National Forest System lands described in this project are either temporary or permanent. **Temporary Roads** are built as proposed to facilitate the construction of the project. They are completely restored at the conclusion of construction and no longer used or open to vehicles. **Permanent Roads** are included as part of the National Forest Road System. They are classified in five levels from Maintenance Level 1 (basic custodial care, closed to vehicles) to Maintenance Level 5 (high comfort, passenger car). This project includes roads that are already included in the National Forest System (e.g., Fiberboard Freeway) and new roads. New roads may be both completely new construction or may utilize portions of old legacy roadways. For this project new roads, which include any road not previously part of the National Forest System, are assumed for analysis to be Maintenance Level 2, to facilitate the long term operational and maintenance needs of the project.

Access Way: The term “access way” is not specifically defined by any of the lead agencies, but is used herein to describe a route within the project area (that may or may not require widening or clearing), that is required for construction and/or operation of the project. For purposes of this document, access ways include several categories of routes, including existing dirt roads, National Forest System roads, existing roads that are not part of a formal designated travel system, new dirt roads constructed as part of the project, and existing and new “two-track” pathways intended for power line operations and maintenance access.

Definitions for other industry terms used in this document are provided in Chapter 9, Acronyms and Glossary.

This page intentionally left blank.